

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed April 1, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed April 1, 2004, claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,367,013 (Bisbee).

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief summary of the present invention is appropriate. The present invention relates to a method for using a previously certified identity (i.e., certificate) to create another representational form for the same identity (page 4, lines 34-36 of the present application). This allows an entity to extend his or her already verified identity for other uses and applications (page 5, lines 2-6). Each different application may require its own unique attributes to be included in a certificate (page 4, lines 1-3). Accordingly, certificates for the different applications require different representational forms (page 4, lines 4-5). When an entity needs to be authenticated in a context where it does not have a previously confirmed identity, the entity supplies verified facts by a registration authority that knows an electronic identity of the entity from a different application. In the example described in the specification, the known electronic identity is the entity's mobile identity (page 5, lines 17-22). In this scenario, the entity's mobile identity is a first electronic identity for use in a first application (i.e., mobile communication) and the entity needs to be authenticated in a second context for a second application in which the entity does not have an electronic identity. A new certificate, i.e., second electronic identity, for use in this second application is issued after verification of the first electronic identity (page 7, lines 2-5).

Independent claim 1 has now been amended to clarify that the first and second identities have two different representational forms for first and second applications, and that the second identity is issued using information from the first electronic identity.

Bisbee fails to disclose the amended recitation of independent claim 1 because Bisbee does not disclose issuing a second electronic identity for identifying an entity in a second application using information from a first electronic identity used in a first application, wherein the representational forms of the first and second electronic identities are different.

Bisbee instead relates to renewing or re-validating an e-original object by applying a current date, time stamp, digital signature, and authentication certificate (see the Abstract of Bisbee). In Bisbee, the only difference between a non-current authentication certificate and a current certificate is the respective validity period. Since Bisbee relates to re-validating an e-original object, the non-current and current authentication certificates each have identical data structures and identical contents except for the validity period (see col. 2, lines 35-42 and col. 4, lines 49-54 of Bisbee). In contrast to the present invention, Bisbee merely relates to renewing an authentication certificate that has an elapsed validity period. There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Bisbee for a second identity having a second representational form for a second application. Since Bisbee discloses only the renewing or re-validating of an e-object which has an expired validity period, Bisbee fails to disclose, teach or suggest issuing a first electronic identity having a first representational form for use by a first entity in a first application and "creating a request for a second electronic identity for use by said first entity in a second application, the request including an identifier of said first entity, said second application requiring said second electronic identity in a second representational form that is different from said first representational form", as is expressly recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-26, being dependent on independent claim 1, are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claim 1.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice to that effect is solicited.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any such fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 

Lance J. Lieberman
Reg. No. 28,437
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: June 1, 2004